

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-38 are pending in the present application. 1, 9, and 16 are the independent claims.

Claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the recitation of "the specifying operation" is indefinite. In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16 to, inter alia, further clarify the claimed subject matter and respectfully submits that the amended claims now even more fully satisfy the requirements of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 138 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-22 and 24-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,178 (Bence, Jr., et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,664 (Estrada et al.). Claim 23 stands under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bence, Jr., et al. in view of Estrada et al. in further view of Japanese Patent Document No. 9282209A (Yuichi). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, a specifying control unit implementing a specifying module firstly specifying any one of the format file and the data file, and secondly specifying another category of file from this one file and that the specifying includes selecting and dragging any one of the format file and the data file.

Independent claims 9 and 16 recite similar features in method and readable-by-computer medium forms, respectively.

By the aforementioned features, an operator can select a data file and drag the data file to a format file or select a format file and drag the format file to the data file. Thus, operational efficiencies can be realized.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that none of Bence, Jr. et al., Estrada et al., and Yuichi teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 9, and 16.

Thus, without conceding the propriety of combining the asserted citations in the manner set forth in the Office Action, the combinations of these citations are likewise deficient.

The primary citation to Bence, Jr. et al. relates to a universal claims formatter which converts known or unknown input file formats to a common file format. Bence, Jr. et al. discusses a conversion that includes determining whether the format of an input file matches a known format and, if it does not, finding a closest matching file format, aligning data to create a format corresponding to the format of the input file. (Bence, Jr. et al., Col. 1, line 60-Col. 2, line 3). However, while Bence Jr. et al. discusses selecting a data file to delivering the selected file to a format file, Bence Jr. et al. is silent as to selecting and dragging a format file to a data file. Thus, the Bence, Jr. et al. does not meet the setting feature of independent claims 1, 9, and 16.

The secondary citation to Estrada et al. relates to a system and method for online/offline uninterrupted updating of rooms in collaboration space and is cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of specifying a file by selecting and dragging any one of the file format and the data file for conversion of the file and FIG. 16 (item 244) of the subject patent is cited for support. (Office Action, page 4). This contention is respectfully traversed.

Estrada et al., with reference to item 244 of FIG. 16, discusses a file upload by either dragging and dropping a file or using a field-open-dialog command to select a file for publication on the world wide web. (Estrada et al., Col. 21, lines 25-30). Further, the selected file is non-HTML file which is to be automatically converted to HTML. (Estrada et al., Col. 20, lines 45-55). However, Estrada et al. is silent as to dragging a format file anywhere. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Estrada et al. adds nothing that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency in the teachings or suggestions of Bence, Jr. et al.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-22 and 24-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The tertiary citation to Yuichi relates to a file setting method and is cited by the Office Action for its teaching of displaying files as a list. (Office Action, page 7). However, Applicant respectfully submits that Yuichi adds nothing that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency in the teachings or suggestions of Bence, Jr. et al.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims

patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this Amendment After Final Rejection clearly places the subject application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not earlier presented, because Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Amendment as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 30, 2004

By: Michael E. Kondoudis
Michael E. Kondoudis
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501